REMARKS

I.   General

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 7-12 and 19-24 include allowable subject matter and would stand allowed if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 6 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 3-5 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of record.

II.   The 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 6 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that claims 6 and 18 are indefinite as to what instructions are identified in the first begin scope instruction and the first end instruction. The Examiner states that "[a] reading implies the inclusion of both the begin and end scope instruction information in the begin scope instruction as well as the end scope instruction," the final Office Action at page 2. Applicant respectfully asserts, however, that the language of claim 6 and 18 clearly set forth that the first begin scope instruction and the first end scope instruction each include information identifying the first begin scope instruction and the first end scope instruction, and therefore the claim is not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

To aid the Examiner in understanding the foregoing claims, the present specification teaches the simultaneous use of multiple scopes, each having a begin scope and an end scope instruction associated therewith, see e.g., Figures 8, 9B, and 9C. An embodiment may, for example, utilize information (e.g., a scope name, see page 18, lines 9-11) identifying each of a corresponding pair of begin scope and end scope instructions within such instructions to properly associate a particular end scope instruction with its corresponding begin scope instruction.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the language of claims 6 and 18 is not indefinite. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections be withdrawn.

III. The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 6, 13, 14, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Howard et al., United States patent number 6,584,505 (hereinafter *Howard*). However, to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must teach every element of the claim, see M.P.E.P. § 2131. Applicant respectfully asserts that *Howard* does not teach every element of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites:

> tracking one or more first client-specific data objects in response to the first begin scope instruction; . . . and removing the first client-specific data objects in response to the first end scope instruction.

Similarly, independent claim 13 recites:

> tracking one or more first client-specific resource data objects in response to the first begin scope instruction; . . . and removing the first client-specific resource data objects in response to the first end scope instruction.

Claim 1 stands rejected over *Howard* for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 13, see the final Office Action at page 4.

In rejecting independent claims 1 and 13, the Examiner again relies upon a user logging into an authentication server to meet the recited first begin scope instruction, a user logging out of the authentication server to meet the recited first end scope instruction, and data tracked in a cookie as meeting the recited first client-specific resource data objects, see the final Office Action at page 3. In response to Applicant having previously pointed out that the cookies (and data) removed by *Howard* are not the same cookies (and data) tracked in response to the user having logged into the authentication server, the Examiner states that "the cookies removed when the user logs out of the authentication server (col. 7, lines 28-29) are created on the client when the authentication server copies them to the client in line 14 of col. 7," see the final Office Action at page 8. However, the foregoing is an incorrect reading

of *Howard*. *Howard* expressly teaches that "when the user logs out, the authentication server sends a message to each web server on the list of sites visited [and e]ach message is a request for the web server to delete any cookies it placed on the client computer system," column 7, lines 30-34. Clearly, the cookies (and data) removed upon a user logging out of the authentication server are the cookies placed on the client computer system by other web servers which were visited by the client computer system since the last logout from the authentication server. Applicant can find no disclosure in *Howard* to teach or suggest deleting the cookie that contains a list of all sites visited by the user since the last logout from the authentication server when the user logs out of the authentication server, nor has the Examiner shown otherwise. As such, *Howard* does not anticipate the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Dependent claims 2, 6, 14, and 18 are each directly or indirectly dependent from one of the above independent claims. Accordingly, without conceding that the Examiner's assertions are valid with respect to the limitations of the rejected dependent claims, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 13. Moreover, these dependent claims are also asserted to be patentable over the applied art in view of their novel claim features.

IV.   The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 3, 5, 15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howard* in view of Haun et al., United States patent number 6,751,658 (hereinafter *Haun*). Claims 4 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howard* in view of Harrison et al, United States patent number 6,691,113 (hereinafter *Harrison*).

Dependent claims 3-5 and 15-17 are each directly or indirectly dependent from one of the above independent claims. The secondary references applied with respect to these dependent claims are not relied upon to cure the above deficiencies identified with respect to the applied art meeting the independent claims. Accordingly, without conceding that the Examiner's assertions are valid with respect to the limitations of the rejected dependent claims, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 13. Moreover, these

dependent claims are also asserted to be patentable over the applied art in view of their novel and non-obvious claim features.

V.   Summary

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner immediately pass the case to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10001428-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail Airbill No. EV482739176US, in an envelope addressed to:
MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Date of Deposit: April 21, 2005

Typed Name: Lisa deCordova

Signature: _____

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
R. Ross Viguet
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 42,203

Date: April 21, 2005

Telephone No. (214) 855-8185